



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,751	06/28/2001	Arvind Prabhakar	P5935	1048

7590 09/12/2005

Wagner Murabito & Hao LLP
Two North Market Street Third /Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/895,751		PRABHAKAR ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Thomas E. Shortledge		2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-48 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lakritz (6,623,529).

As to claims 1 and 10, Lakritz teaches:

a markup language document (HTML content, col. 7, line 19);

identifying a localizable string within said token (col. 7, lines 27-29)

creating a file including a translation of at least one said localizable string (separating country or regional content from the structure of the document into a separate file, where that file can be updated, col. 7, lines 12-18);

creating a second file including non-localized data from said document (separating out the country or regional content into a separate file, leaving the other content in a separate file, col. 7, lines 12-18); and

merging said first file and said second file (finding the correct localization file, and putting the files back together, col. 7, lines 18-20).

As to claim 19, Lakritz teaches:

a processor (a computer, col. 3, lines 25, which would necessarily include a processor);

a memory storing program instructions (a computer with applications, col. 3, lines 25, which would necessarily include a memory);

identifying a localizable string within said token (col. 7, lines 27-29)

creating a file including a translation of at least one said localizable string (separating country or regional content from the structure of the document into a separate file, where that file can be updated, col. 7, lines 12-18);

creating a second file including non-localized data from said document (separating out the country or regional content into a separate file, leaving the other content in a separate file, col. 7, lines 12-18); and

merging said first file and said second file (finding the correct localization file, and putting the files back together, col. 7, lines 18-20).

As to claims 28, and 35, Lakritz teaches:

identify at least one token within said document (col. 7, lines 27-29);

identify a localizable string within said token (col. 7, lines 27-29);

extract said localizable string from said document (separating country or regional content from the structure of the document into a separate file, where that file can be updated, col. 7, lines 12-18);

translate at least one said extracted localizable string (supplying a translation, col. 7, lines 36-40);

extracting non-localizable string from said document (separating out the country or regional content into a separate file, leaving the other content in a separate file, col. 7, lines 12-18); and

merging said extracted non-localizable data with at least one of said translated extracted localizable string and said extracted localizable string (finding the correct localization file, and putting the files back together, col. 7, lines 18-20).

As to claim 42, Lakritz teaches:

a processor (a computer, col. 3, lines 25, which would necessarily include a processor);

a memory storing program instructions (a computer with applications, col. 3, lines 25, which would necessarily include a memory);

identify at least one token within said document (col. 7, lines 27-29);

identify a localizable string within said token (col. 7, lines 27-29);

extract said localizable string from said document (separating country or regional content from the structure of the document into a separate file, where that file can be updated, col. 7, lines 12-18);

translate at least one said extracted localizable string (supplying a translation, col. 7, lines 36-40);

extracting non-localizable string from said document (separating out the country or regional content into a separate file, leaving the other content in a separate file, col. 7, lines 12-18); and

merging said extracted non-localizable data with at least one of said translated extracted localizable string and said extracted localizable string (finding the correct localization file, and putting the files back together, col. 7, lines 18-20).

As to claims 2, 11, 20, 29, 36, and 43, Lakritz teaches prompting a user for confirmation of said identifying at least one localizable string (users are allowed to edit the information, col. 8, lines 53-56).

As to claims 3, 12 and 21, Lakritz teaches creating a third file including at least one said localizable string (creating a separate file for each of the country or regions for

Art Unit: 2654

the content to be translated into (col. 7, lines 12-18), which would necessary include creating a third or more file).

As to claims 4, 13 and 22, Lakritz teaches merging includes merging said third file (merging the files based on the needed translation (col. 7, lines 12-18, and 27-40), where it would be necessary that if the information from the third file was needed, that information would be merged).

As to claims 5, 14, 23, 30, 37 and 44, Lakritz teaches editing said first file to provide a user-supplied translation (visitors to the website are able to edit the content, col. 8, lines 53-57).

As to claims 6, 15, 24, 31, 38, and 45, Lakritz teaches merging further includes recording said user-supplied translation within said first file into a dictionary module (saving the visitors translations for a later use, col. 8, lines 53-60).

As to claims 7, 16, 25, 32, 39, and 46, Lakritz teaches one of a dictionary translation and a user-supplied translation (using a dictionary translation and a user supplied translation, col. 7, lines 45, and col. 8, lines 53-56).

As to claims 8, 17, 26, 33, 40 and 47, Lakritz teaches screening a string of characters with said document whether said string of characters is at least one of

Art Unit: 2654

bounded and unbounded (finding a string to be translated that is bounded by the tags, col. 7, line 35).

As to claims 9, 18, 27, 34, 41 and 48, Lakritz teaches said localizable string includes at least one of data and executable code (a string in text, col. 7, lines 35-36).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is (571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2654

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TS
09/06/2005



RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER